REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1 – 20 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent.

In the present response, the drawings are amended, claims 12 and 13 are cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1 – 4, 7 – 11, 14, 15 and 18 – 20 are amended. The support for the claim amendments may be found in Applicant's specification, for example page 4, lines 13 – 23 and other places. No new matter is added.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFT 1.83(a) because the drawings do not have descriptive text labels. In the attached Replacement Drawing Sheets, Applicant has added descriptive text labels to the rectangular boxes. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement; and under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in the claims.

In the Office Action, page 3, it is alleged by the Office that the "beacon interval" has not been mentioned or explained in the specification, and that the term "beacon interval" is not deemed to be readily understood by one having ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with such allegations and points out that the term "beacon interval" is disclosed in Applicants' specification, page 4, line 1. Applicant further submits that the term "beacon interval" is a well known term in the art. For example, in the IEEE standard for 802.11, the term "beacon interval" is clearly defined (see, IEEE-std 802.11-2007, page 88, section 7.3.1.3). The present invention relates to wireless systems, and thus a person ordinarily skilled in the art would be familiar with the 802.11 standards and therefore would understand the term "beacon interval".

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Cimini, JR. et al. (US Publication No. 20030133427, hereinafter "Cimini").

Applicant submits that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 – 20 are patentable over Cimini.

For example, claim 1, in part, requires:

> "*determining an allocated transmission time for each of the plurality of wireless stations based on a set physical transmission rate.*"

Cimini, apparently discloses that the packet size is chosen inversely proportional to the node data rate (paragraph [0042]), and that packet size is set so that the maximum transmission times of different data rates are approximately the same (paragraph [0050]).

In contrast, the claimed invention requires an allocated transmission time depends on a set physical transmission rate and thus the transmissions times of the wireless stations are not necessary approximately the same. The wireless stations have different set physical transmission rates because they have different needs and thus different set transmission rates are needed for their respective different levels of Quality of Service. A wireless station could have a

longer allocated transmission time if its needs are higher than others, thus the wireless stations in the claimed invention are not required to have approximately equal transmission time. Therefore, Cimini fails to disclose the claimed feature: determining an allocated transmission time for each of the plurality of wireless stations based on a set physical transmission rate.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Cimini.

Similarly, independent claim 11, in part, requires:

> "*the access point allocates a transmission time for each of the wireless stations based on their transmission requirements at a set physical transmission rate that is fixed for the service interval*."

Applicant essentially repeats the above arguments for claim 1 and applies them to claim 11 pointing out why Cimini fails to disclose that an allocated transmission time depends on a set physical transmission rate. Therefore, claim 11 is patentable over Cimini.

Claims 2 – 10 and 14 – 20 are patentable because at least they respectively depend from claims 1 and 11, with each claim containing further distinguishing features. The rejection of claims 12 and 13 is moot because they are cancelled.

Withdrawal of the rejection of clams 1 – 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the

Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hay Yeung Cheung/
By: Hay Yeung Cheung
Registration No.: 56,666
For: Larry Liberchuk
Registration No.: 40,352
(914) 333-9602

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001